

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-8, 10-17 and 20 are now present in the application. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Claims 1, 7, 8 and 11 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Reasons For Entry Of Amendments

As discussed in greater detail hereinafter, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are improper and should immediately be withdrawn. Accordingly, the finality of the Final Office Action mailed on March 7, 2005 should be withdrawn.

If the Examiner persists in maintaining his rejections, Applicants submit that this Amendment was not presented at an earlier date in view of the fact that Applicants are responding to a new ground of rejection set forth in the Final Office Action. In accordance with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.116, Applicants respectfully request entry and consideration of the foregoing amendments as they remove issues for appeal.

Drawings

The Examiner has not indicated whether or not the formal drawings have been approved. Since no objection has been received, Applicants assume that the drawings are acceptable and that no further action is necessary. Confirmation thereof in the next Office Action is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8, 10-14, 17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews, III et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,025,837 (hereinafter "Matthews"), in view of Smith, U.S. Patent No. 5,933,141 (hereinafter "Smith"), and further in view of Kim et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,788,347 (hereinafter "Kim"). Claims 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Smith and Kim, and further in view of Peyer, U.S. Patent No. 6,788,347 (hereinafter "Peyer"), and Garber, U.S. Patent No. 6,560,616 (hereinafter "Garber"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

In light of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. While not conceding to the Examiner's rejection, but merely to expedite prosecution, as the Examiner will note, independent claims 1 and 7 have been amended to address the Examiner's rejections. In particular, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of steps including "displaying simple data information on the screen... the simple data information including size information identifying a size of a television picture to be displayed with the detailed version of the HTML document". Independent claim 7 has been amended to recite a combination of steps including "and displaying television picture size information identifying a picture size of a general television picture to be displayed with a detailed version of the data information".

In addition, independent claim 8 recites a combination of steps including "displaying a picture size information identifying a picture size of a general television picture to be displayed

with a different version of the data information”. Independent claim 11 recites a combination of elements including “displays, on the screen, simple data information..., and the simple data information includes... television picture size information identifying a picture size of a general television picture to be displayed with a detailed version of the data information”.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combinations of steps and elements as set forth in amended independent claims 1 and 7 and in previously presented claims 8 and 11 are not disclosed or suggested by references relied on by the Examiner.

The Examiner has correctly acknowledged that Matthews and Smith fail to teach displaying size information identifying a size of a television picture to be displayed. However, the Examiner alleged that Kim in FIG. 10 and col. 32, lines 32-38 teaches displaying size information identifying a size of a television picture to be displayed. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In fact, Kim in FIG. 10 and col. 32, lines 32-38 merely discloses that an original video picture may be adjusted by using resampling ratio profiles to fit within the display area based on the video transmission format having either a 16x9 or 4x3 aspect ratio. Kim nowhere teaches displaying a size of the picture *to be displayed with a different (or detail version) of the data information (or the HTML document)* as recited in claims 1, 7, 8 or 11. In particular, FIG. 10 of Kim merely shows a chart of image diagrams which illustrate the effect of using resampling ratio profiles (see also col. 4, lines 44-46). Kim fails to teach that the information of the chart in FIG. 10 is displayed on the screen. Kim also fails to teach that the information of the chart corresponds to a different version (or detail version) of the data information (or the HTML document) as recited in claims 1, 7, 8 and 11.

Therefore, Kim fails to teach “displaying... size information identifying a size of a television picture to be displayed with the detailed version of the HTML document” as recited in amended independent claim 1, “displaying television picture size information identifying a picture size of a general television picture to be displayed with a detailed version of the data information” as recited in amended independent claim 7, “displaying a picture size information identifying a picture size of a general television picture to be displayed with a different version of the data information” as recited in independent claim 8, and “displays... television picture size information identifying a picture size of a general television picture to be displayed with a detailed version of the data information” as recited in independent claim 11.

With regard to the Examiner’s reliance on Peyer and Garber, these references have only been relied on for their teachings related to the subject matter of dependent claims. These references also fail to disclose the above combinations of steps and elements as set forth in independent claims 1, 7, 8 and 11. Accordingly, these references fail to cure the deficiencies of Matthews, Smith and Kim.

Accordingly, none of these references individually or in combination teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claims 1 and 7 and previously presented independent claims 8 and 11. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 7, 8 and 11 and their dependent claims clearly define over the teachings of the utilized references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By Esther Chong
Esther H. Chong
Reg. No. 40,953

EHC/GH/mmi/asc

6/10

P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000